



## **COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING**

**APPROVED**

### **Curriculum Review Committee Meeting (Special) Monday, August 26, 2002 CPOST Headquarters**

#### **In Attendance:**

Lt. Pietro DeSantis II, Committee Chairperson  
Dr. Paul Bestolarides, Committee Member  
Mr. Doug Peterson, Committee Member  
Ms. Mary McElhannon, Committee Member  
Ms. Merrie M. Wilson, CPOST (Recorder)  
Ms. Shirley Hanes, CDC Parole  
Mr. Michael Jaime, CDC Dept. Training Office  
Ms. Paula French, CPOST

Ms. Mary Wakefield, YATC  
Ms. Gretchen Jung, Hq SDC  
Mr. Jim Anderson, Hq ODT  
Ms. Allison Malloy, YATC  
Ms. Laurel Alvarez, CPOST  
Dr. Robert Main, ODT  
Ms. Sally Morgan, YATC  
Ms. Monique Ford, CPOST

#### **Committee Member(s) Absent:** None

#### **I. Introductions**

A special Curriculum Review Committee meeting was convened on Monday, August 26, 2002 at CPOST Headquarters, 3161 Dwight Road, Elk Grove, CA. The Committee Chairperson, Lt. DeSantis, and recorder, Merrie M. Wilson, were present. A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. Introductions followed.

#### **II. Lesson Plan Revisions**

A discussion on lesson plan revisions was held and several suggestions were made on how to avoid lesson plans receiving 'provisional approval' for minor corrections thus being held from 'full approval' and being able to be taught at the next academy.

It was suggested that a computer with a zip drive and a room/cubicle be made available to departmental instructional designers for the purpose of making necessary changes to lesson plans during breaks to expedite recommendations for full approval. This would enable the lesson plans to be recommended for full approval and subsequently brought before the CPOST Executive Board at their next regularly scheduled meeting, rather than waiting two months. The suggestion met favorably with the Curriculum Review Committee members, and Lt. DeSantis stated that he would make the necessary request to the Executive Director of CPOST.

### III. Approval Levels

A continuation discussion of the *CPOST Curriculum Review Committee Procedure for Submitting Lesson Plans for Review* from April 25, 2002 was held, and it was suggested that the following changes be made to paragraph 3, Submission Deadlines, subparagraph b:

**AS READS:** “b. Lesson plans that were provisionally approved by the Committee must be resubmitted within 30 days of approval of the minutes of the Curriculum meeting at which the latest review was conducted. Lesson plans that were previously disapproved must be resubmitted within 60 days. If the Departments are unable to meet the 30- or 60-day deadline, they may request an extension from the Committee.”

**CHANGED TO READ:** “b. Lesson plans that were disapproved by the Committee must be resubmitted within 60 days of approval of minutes of the Curriculum meeting at which the latest review was conducted. If the Departments are unable to meet the 60-day deadline, they may request an extension from the Committee.”

A discussion of the *CPOST Curriculum Review Committee Approval Levels and Times Lines* from April 25, 2002 followed, and it was suggested that the following changes be made to paragraph 2, Approval Levels, subparagraphs a, b, and c:

**AS READS:** “a. Full – The Committee has reviewed the lesson plan and finds no changes are required to be in compliance with the *CPOST Standards for Course Curricula*. Upon submission to and approval by the CPOST Executive Board, the department may implement the training course. Lesson plans will be resubmitted by the Departments for CPOST review at least every three years. The three-year date begins with approval by the CPOST Executive Board. This change will impact lesson plans approved after May 1, 2002.”

**CHANGED TO READ:** “a. Approved – The Committee has reviewed the lesson plan and finds no changes are required to be in compliance with the *CPOST Standards for Course Curricula*. Lesson plans will be resubmitted by the departments for CPOST review at least every three years. The three-year date begins with approval by the CPOST Executive Board. This will impact lesson plans approved after May 1, 2002. Upon receiving a recommendation for Approval from the Committee, the departments are authorized to teach the lesson plan until the CPOST Executive Board takes action.

**AS READS:** “b. Provisional...”. This subparagraph is deleted.

**AS READS:** “c. Disapproval – The identified deficiencies are so numerous as to require a full resubmission to the CPOST Curriculum Review Committee. Training may not be implemented.”

**CHANGED TO READ:** “b. Disapproved – Changes have been identified by the Committee to bring the lesson plan into compliance with the *CPOST Standard for Course Curricula*. Identified deficiencies must be corrected within sixty days of the latest review of the lesson plan. A designer’s change memo identifying the corrections should accompany the lesson plan when it is returned to CPOST. Upon submission of all corrections, the Disapproved will be reviewed for a recommendation of Approval. Training may not be implemented.

It was also suggested that changes be made to paragraph 3, subparagraphs a. and b., of *CPOST Curriculum Review Committee Approval Levels and Times Lines*. The changes are as follows

**AS READS:** “a. Substantive Change – Any modification that alters the performance stated in an objective, or that impacts or changes one or more of the objectives or test (i.e., law changes, policy, MOU, addition/deletion of objectives, test bank development, etc). Lesson plans identified as having a substantive change will require a full resubmission to the CPOST Curriculum Review Committee.”

**CHANGED TO READ:** “a. Substantive Change – Any modification that alters the performance stated in an objective, or that impacts or changes one or more of the objectives or 15% or more of the test items (i.e., law changes, policy, MOU, addition/deletion of objectives, test bank development, etc). Lesson plans identified as having a substantive change will require a full resubmission to the CPOST Curriculum Review Committee. Lesson plans re-submitted to CPOST may use strikethrough and underline to allow for an expedient review.”

**AS READS:** “b. Non-Substantive Changes – Lesson plans with corrections to spelling, punctuation, and grammar. Non-substantive changes require a designer’s change memo and the corrected lesson plan be submitted to CPOST. Lesson plans will be compared to existing copies in CPOST’s files for verification of the changes. If the changes are non-substantive, and they have been approved for less than two years, they will be submitted to the CPOST Executive Board for confirmation of a full approval. The approval will only apply through the original resubmission date, three years after the lesson plan was initially approved.”

**CHANGED TO READ:** “b. Non-Substantive Changes – Lesson plans with corrections to spelling, punctuation, and grammar, or less than 15% of the test items. Test item changes will require substantiation of problems, based on Item Analysis for a period of time (two or more academics) along with their resubmission. Resubmission of test items under this section will require submission of the objective, applicable content and exercises, and the changed test items. Non-substantive changes require a designer’s change memo and the lesson plan corrections submitted to CPOST may use strikethrough and underline to allow for an expedient review. Lesson plans will be compared to existing copies in CPOST’s files for verification of the changes. If the changes are non-substantive, and they have been approved for less than two years, they will be submitted to the CPOST Executive Board for confirmation of a full approval. The approval will only apply through the original resubmission date, three years after the lesson plan was initially approved.

#### **IV. Testing Standards**

After discussion regarding development of testing standards, it was suggested that a subcommittee be established and charged with developing testing standards and reviewing and clarifying existing CPOST curricula standards. Two subcommittees have been formed; the volunteers are:

**Curriculum Review Committee, Lesson Plan Testing Standard Sub-Committee.** The objectives of this sub-committee are:

- (1) The CPOST Curriculum Review Testing Standard Sub-Committee is charged with developing testing standards that will be implemented for those departments falling under the jurisdiction of the Commission.

- (2) The CPOST Curriculum Review Testing Standard Sub-Committee is charged with developing testing standards that will involve members appointed by the Committee and outside contractors. Members currently appointed are Shirley Hanes, Mary Wakefield, Mary McElhannon, Robert Main, Michael Jaime, Paul Bestolarides, and Pietro DeSantis. CPOST staff Laurel Alvarez has volunteered her services to the sub-committee as an assistant and to facilitate approval of contracts through CPOST.
- (3) The CPOST Curriculum Review Testing Standard Sub-Committee is charged with developing testing standards that will incorporate in their review, but not limited to, the following six areas of concern:
  - Establish criteria for development of test items
  - Determine types of test items
  - Establish pass points
  - Establish Individual/Group measurement
  - Establish criteria for revision of test items
  - Establish general security protocols

**Curriculum Review Committee Curricula Standards Sub-Committee.** The objectives of this sub-committee are:

- (1) The CPOST Curriculum Review Curricula Standards Sub-Committee is charged with reviewing and clarifying existing CPOST curricula standards.
- (2) The CPOST Curriculum Review Curricula Standards Sub-Committee is charged with reviewing existing curricula standards that will involve members appointed by the Committee. Members currently appointed are Shirley Hanes, Gary Parks, Mary McElhannon, Gretchen Jung, Michael Jaime, and Pietro DeSantis. CPOST staff Laurel Alvarez has volunteered her services to the sub-committee as an assistant.

## **V. Curricula Standards**

Ms. Mary McElhannon, Bureau Chief, Curricula Design, Youth Authority Training Center presented a breakdown of the Commission on Correctional Peace Officer Standards and Training, *Standards for Course Curricula*, as follows.

The Commission on Correctional Peace Officer Standards and Training has established minimum standards for course curricula to help ensure quality instruction is provided to correctional peace officers. These standards were initially developed in close collaboration with experienced curricula developers and trainers in 1998. In August 2002, the standards were revised in keeping with the instructional systems design process.

The standards for Correctional Peace Officer training curricula fall into two categories. The first set of standards applies to the entire program of instruction (course). The second set applies to each lesson plan within the course. It was clarified that 'course' refers to/means the 'academy', and a lesson plan applies to each of the classes (subjects) within the course/academy.

**Course** standards shall consist of:

- A statement of need for the course
- Target audience to be trained
- A list of all lesson plans comprising the course in the recommended order of presentation
- A list of prerequisites for each lesson within the course
- Recommended/required instructor qualifications
- Standard safety provisions
- A description of how the course will be evaluated for overall program effectiveness

**Lesson plan** standards shall consist of:

- A statement of need for the lesson
- A cover sheet that identifies:
  - Title of training course
  - Title of lesson
  - Instructional Designer(s)
  - Date prepared
  - Date of CPOST approval (or place holder)
  - Date of last revision (or place holder)
  - Time allotted for presentation in hours/minutes
  - Recommended maximum participants
  - Number of instructional staff recommended to effectively and safely present the lesson
  - Equipment, facilities and/or materials required to present the lesson
- Instructional goals that are related to job ensure performance
- Learning objectives related to job performance
- Content and instructional activities that are aligned with learning goals and objectives
- Instructional resources to be employed when presenting the lesson plan. All instructional resources shall be aligned with training goals and instructional objectives.
- Performance measures that assess whether learning objectives have been accomplished.
- A list of all references cited, texts, resources, and subject matter experts used in developing the lesson.

## **VI. Adjournment**

As time approached for the duty-day to end, Lt. Pietro DeSantis, Chair, Curriculum Review Committee moved to recess until 9:00 a.m., Tuesday, August 27, 2002 at which the remaining business could be completed. Motion was seconded and a vote was taken; motion carried. Meeting recessed 3:50 p.m.

**Tuesday, August 27, 2002**

Lt. DeSantis, Chair, Curriculum Review Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

Lt. DeSantis moved to recommend the establishment of the Lesson Plan Testing Standard Sub-Committee; motion was seconded. A vote was taken and motion carried.

Lt DeSantis moved to recommend the establishment of the Curricula Standards Sub-Committee; motion was seconded. A vote was taken and motion carried.

Lt. DeSantis moved to recommend approval of the changes made to the *Approval Levels and Timelines*, and *Procedure for Submitting Lesson Plans for Review* documents; motion was seconded. A vote was taken and motion carried.

Lt. DeSantis asked if there was any other business to be discussed. Dr. Bestolarides asked for clarification of duties/responsibilities of the 'alternate' committee members, Ms. Mary McElhannon and Mr. Doug Peterson. For the record: Ms. Mary McElhannon, on the side of Management, will assume the vote should Dr. Bestolarides be unable to attend a Curriculum Review Committee meeting due to any unforeseen circumstances; and, Mr. Doug Peterson, on the side of Labor, will assume the vote in the event that Lt. DeSantis being unable to attend a Curriculum Review Committee meeting due to any unforeseen circumstances.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

/s/

Merrie M. Wilson  
Office Technician, CPOST  
Recorder